

Remarks***Claim Objections – Claims 1-4, 6-9 and 12***

The items noted by the Examiner in paragraph 1 of the Office Action have been corrected in the amendments set forth above.

Allowable Subject Matter – Claims 3-5, 9-10 and 12

Claims 3, 9 and 12 have been rewritten as an independent claims including all of the limitations of the original base claim and any original intervening claim. Claims 4 and 5 from Claim 3. Claim 9 depends from Claim 10. Claims 3-5, 9-10 and 12 are now felt to be in condition for allowance.

Rejections Under Section 102 – Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11, 15-16 and 19

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11, 15-16 and 19 were rejected under Section 102(b) as being anticipated by Sugiyama (5,745,911) or Sakai (4,818,131) or both. Sugiyama and Sakai both teach an electronic typewriter with a spell checker. Claim 1 has been amended to recite a processor operative to receive and process an electronic representation of a document in a page description language. Claim 15 has been amended to recite computer readable code for causing a printer to accept a page description language input print job file. Support for the amendments to Claims 1 and 15 is found in the Specification at page 3, lines 10-18. The amendments to Claims 1 and 15 exclude electronic typewriters and clarify that the claimed print apparatus and code is capable of processing PDL files received from a printer driver on a client computer, a printer driver on a hand-held computer, a printer driver on the print apparatus, or any other source capable of generating an electronic representation of a document in a page description language.

Claims 1 and 15 are now felt to distinguish patentably over Sugiyama and Sakai. Claims 2, 6, 7, and 11, and Claim 19 are also felt to distinguish patentably over the cited references due to their dependence on Claims 1 and 15, respectively.

Rejections Under Section 103 – Claims 8, 13 and 20


Claims 8 and 20 were rejected under Section 103 as being obvious over Sakai as applied to Claims 1, 7 and 15 in view of Do (6,275,709). Claim 13 was rejected under Section 103 as being obvious over Sakai as applied to Claims 1 and 7 in view of Haartsen (6,028,853).

For the reasons noted above, Sakai does not teach or suggest all of the elements of amended Claims 1 and 15. For these same reasons, Claims 8, 13 and

20 also distinguish over the combination of Sakai and Do or Haartsen.

The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,
John Laughlin

By 
Steven R. Ormiston
Reg. No. 35,974
208.433.1991 x204

December 2, 2003